

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEFARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,649	04/02/2004	Linda S. Powers	13368.0002 3407	
759	00 11/13/2006		EXAMINER	
K. S. Cornaby			SAUCIER, SANDRA E	
Suite 1500				
170 South Main Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Salt Lake City, UT 84101			1651	

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comment		10/817,649	POWERS ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Sandra Saucier	1651				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	dress			
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this ∝ ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Oc	ctoher 2006					
·	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
-,ك	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	<u> </u>						
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner	ſ.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1:85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	· ·	or and continued copies that receive					
Attachment	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F					
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3 are pending and are considered on the merits.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3 remain rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-24 of U.S. Patent No. US 6,750,006 [A]. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they

Application/Control Number: 10/817,649 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

are not patentably distinct from each other because the excitation range is overlapping. Further, while the range of energies for detecting is not specifically stated in the claims, the Figure 3F, demonstrates collection of emission in 700-850 nm range.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Saucier whose telephone number is (571) 272-0922. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, M. Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/817,649

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866–217–9197 (toll-free).

Sandra Saucier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651 November 8, 2006 Page 4